From: Shaw, Barbara
To: Sanders, David
Cc: King, Barbara; Desai, Reshma
Subject: RE: ISL Questions
Date: Sunday, March 20, 2011 4:02:27 PM
Attachments: NRI Communities FY 11.docx

David: Here are the responses to your questions:

1) The FY 12 contractual and travel requests are not increases over the FY 11 appropriation. In fact, IVPA is requesting less in both of these lines. The percents/increases you are referring to (ISL pg 12) reflect the difference between our expected expenses for FY 11 and the FY 12 request. We restricted travel and contractual expenses in FY 11 as requested by GOMB, and requested lower amounts in these line items for FY 12, although more than we projected to spend in FY 11 because we do hope to restore more normal spending patterns in these categories . For example, we want to conduct more monitoring site visits in FY 12 and to convene grantees for training and program development purposes, which we reduced significantly in FY 11.

   EDP is increased by $1,000 because we need to purchase two new computers to replace old, poorly functioning PCs.

   I also want to point out that when you have small budget numbers like IVPA does, even a minor increase or decrease in dollar amount (such as $1,000) can translate to a large percentage, even though the amount is fairly insignificant.

2) IVPA does not anticipate any chargebacks or sweeps from Fund 184 in FY 11. In the past (FY 04-07), a total of $367,209 was swept or charged back from Fund 184 which had a negative impact on IVPA grants and operations because theses sweeps/chargebacks, coupled with declining revenue into the fund from PV License Plate sales, reduced the balance of Fund 184 to the extent that there was a shortfall in available funds in subsequent fiscal years resulting in IVPA not being able to expend our full appropriation, including in FY 11.

3) As described in # 1 above, this is not an increase in the appropriation from FY 11 to FY 12; it is the difference between estimated FY 11 expenses and the FY 12 request. Also, as explained in #2, because of declining revenues and sweeps , IVPA has not always been able to implement our full appropriation from Fund 184. We are maintaining the FY 12 request at the same level as FY 11 anticipating that we might be able to spend at a level closer to the appropriated amount.

4) The increase in the Family Violence Coordinating Council Program is only $1,700. I don't know where the $118,700 figure you presented comes from.

5) The fiscal impact of these transfers totals $16,293,700 ($12,175,600 in federal funds and $4,118,100 in State GRF funds). We have not yet been given much information about these programs, but we do anticipate that if all these transfers occur, that there would be at least one (1) additional headcount associated with the transfers.

6) IVPA is not cutting the GRF supported Violence Prevention Grants. As indicated in the notes on pgs 1,8 et al, $700,000 of the total GRF supported Violence Prevention Grants in FY 11 came

from the Governor's Lump Sum. In FY 12, the $700,00 is included in the GRP Grants line. In other words, the funding was moved from a lump sum to the GRF grants line in FY 12.

7) Neighborhood Recovery Initiative (NRI):
   a. IVPA does not maintain these statistics. This information may be available from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority; IDPH may also have some violence data from its emergency department and trauma data.
   b. The list of funded NRI communities is attached.
   c. These communities were selected for the NRI Program primarily because they were identified in late 2009 by DHS, IDPA and ICJIA (when the Safety Net Works youth violence prevention program was initiated) as communities that have high rates of violence, poverty student disconnectedness from school.
   d. With the exception of the portion of the NRI funds allocated for expanding the Safety Net Works program, all participating communities, except those in the South Suburbs, were given the same amount of baseline funding to implement specific program components. This funding enables each community to establish a baseline capacity to implement the program components and to reach a baseline number of youth and parents and provide a baseline number of jobs. The South Suburban sites are receiving less funding, because the funding available for the townships in the South Suburbs ($3 million) is being divided into three sites.

8) Each of the 18 Chicago neighborhoods and Cicero and Maywood have been awarded a baseline of $1.225 million. In addition, there are nine (9) of these communities that currently do not have a Safety Net Works program that will receive $300K to create a Safety Net Works program for their community. The remaining eleven (11) communities that already have a Safety Net Works program (asterisked on the attached list) will receive an additional $100,000 to expand their SNW program. The South Suburbs will receive a total of $3 million, $800K each for the three sites and $600K total for a Safety Net Works program that will serve all four South Suburban townships.

I hope this answers your questions. Please let me know if you need further information.

Thanks,
Barbara

To: King, Barbara
Cc: Shaw, Barbara
Subject: ISL Questions

Barbara King and Barbara Shaw,

After reviewing IVPA ISL and our recent conversations on the phone, I have a few further questions.

1) Could you please explain the increases in the following operational costs:
   a. Contractual Services, $15,500 or 63.3%.
   b. Travel, $3,000 or 50%
   c. EDP $1,000 or 33%
2) Have there been or do you predict any chargbacks/sweeps to the Violence Prevention Fund (184) in FY11? How have fund sweeps impacted IVPA operations?
3) Could you please explain the $100,000 increase from Fund 184 for the IVPA Grant Community & Statewide Program? What areas does IPVA plan to use the increase funding?
4) Please explain the $118,700 increase to the IL Family Violence Coordinating Council Program? What does IPVA plan to use the increase funding for?

5) IVPA was transferred 4 federal grant programs and two GRF grant programs from DHS. What is the fiscal impact these transferred programs have on IVPA? In order to administer these grants, will there be a headcount increase in future fiscal years?

6) Could you please explain why IVPA has decided to cut the Violence Prevention Grant in FY12, but plans to keep the other two Lump Sums, Safety Net Works and Neighborhood Recovery Initiative?

Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

7) The Neighborhood Recovery Grant is a program for violent Illinois' neighborhoods and the current focus is Chicago neighborhoods.
   a. Could you provide me with a chart of the most violent neighborhoods across all of Illinois and a chart of violent neighborhoods in Chicago?
   b. What neighborhoods are receiving funding?
   c. Are the neighborhoods that are being funded, the most violent neighborhoods or are there other factors determining IVPA's decision to fund these neighborhoods?
   d. How do you determine the level of funding per neighborhood?

8) Could you provide me with a breakdown on how much funding per neighborhood was spent through the Neighborhood Recovery Grant? For example, I read that approximately $1.3 million of the funding will be allocated to Pilsen and Little Village. (Adentro de Pilsen, Nov. 15, 2010)

Thank you for your responses,

David

J. David Sanders
Senate Republican Staff
(217) 558-2702
[redacted] (cell)